

REMARKS

Claims 2, 7, 12, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, and 30 have been canceled. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-18, 21-23, and 26-28, amended claims 1, 6, 11, 31 and 32, and new claims 33 and 34 are in this application.

Claim 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasonic in view of Lawler et al.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended herein so as to respectively include the features of 19/20, 24/25, and 29/30; and independent claims 31 and 32 have been similarly amended herein. As a result and as an example, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"means for displaying a content of the selected program when the selected program is a future program; and

means for switching to the selected program when the selected program is a present program."

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner does not appear to specifically disclose the above features now recited in claim 1. That is, in explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claims 19 and 20, the Examiner appears to rely on Panasonic and, in particular, Later show Cheers, Channel Guide Screen on page 24 and Viewing Live Television 3 on page 20 thereof.

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified relied on portions of Panasonic do not appear to disclose all of the above features now specifically recited

in claim 1. As an example, the respective relied on portion of Panasonic does not appear to specifically disclose "means for displaying a content of the selected program when the selected program is a future program." So, and as an example, after a user selects a program which is a future program, a content of such selected future program may be displayed. The respective portion of Panasonic relied on by the Examiner does not appear to disclose such content display after selection of a future program.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as presented herein is distinguishable from the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that independent claims 6, 11, 31 and 32 as presented herein are distinguishable from the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, and 15-18, 21-23, and 26-28 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims and, as such, are also distinguishable from the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 4, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasoni in view of Lawler et al. and further in view of Lemmons.

Claims 4, 9, and 14 are dependent from one of the independent claims and are also distinguishable from the combination of Panasonic and Lawler applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons discussed above. The Examiner does not appear to have relied upon Lemmons to overcome the above described deficiencies of Panasonic. As such, claims 4, 9, and

14 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Panasonic, Lawler and Lemmons.

New independent claims 33 and 34 have been added herein. It is believed that the present application provides support for the features of claims 33 and 34. With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to Figs. 3 and 4 and the corresponding description thereof of the present application.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant(s)